

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,169	09/30/2003	Masao Fujiki	04329.3152	9806
7590 01/06/2005		EXAMINER		
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			OLSON, JASON C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2651	<u>-</u>
			DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/673,169	FUJIKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jason C Olson	2651			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	opears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	February 2004.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdred Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 February 2004</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obje e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ection is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applic iority documents have been rece au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage			
Attachmer	· ·	o [T]	(DTO 440)			
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/30/2003</u> .	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 8) 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2651

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito et al. (US 6,771,449) referred to as Ito.

Regarding claim 1, Ito teaches a disk device having a head (see col. 3, ln. 61-67), a sensor which detects fall (see col. 3, ln. 53-60), and a control unit configured to control the disk device to move the head to an unload area (see col. 4, ln. 3-5) using a signal which is independent from commands that are processed by the disk device in an order which they are accepted, when the sensor detects the fall (see col. 6, ln. 39-50).

Regarding claim 2, Ito teaches the device is a magnetic device, and the head is a magnetic head (see col. 3, ln. 61-67).

Regarding claims 3 Ito teaches the signal is a reset signal of an interface standard with which the disk device complies (see col. 6, ln. 39-50; it is understood by the examiner that Ito teaches a reset signal as described by the applicant on page 12, lines 13-18 of the instantaneous specification).

Regarding claim 4, Ito teaches an independent signal line configured to exchange the signal (see figure 11, the inner circuit has an independent line to transport an independent

Art Unit: 2651

signal), and wherein the control unit transmits the signal to the disk device via the independent signal line (see col. 6, ln. 39-50).

Regarding claim 5, Ito teaches a shock-absorbing unit which absorbs a shock that acts upon falling from a height (h) when a time required to move the head to the unload area under the control of the control unit is given by a falling time (t), satisfies an active-time shockproof specification of the disk device (see col. 5, ln. 29-46; it is understood by the examiner that Ito teaches an active-time shockproof specification as described by the applicant on page 8, lines 15-20 of the instantaneous specification).

Regarding claim 7, Ito teaches the sensor is an agravity sensor using a mechanical switch, which is opened, in an agravity state (see col. 4, ln. 16-24, figures 3 and 4; it is understood by the examiner that Ito teaches an agravity sensor as described by the applicant on page 10, lines 4-6 of the instantaneous specification).

Regarding claims 8-11 and 13: claims 8-11 and 13 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection(s), and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 14-16: method claims 14-16 are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 1-5 and 7. Therefore method claims 14-16 correspond to apparatus claims 1-5 and 7 and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above.

Regarding claims 17-19: method claims 17-19 are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 8-11 and 13. Therefore method claims 17-19 correspond to apparatus claims 8-11 and 13 and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above.

Art Unit: 2651

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito.

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Ito teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 8 above. Ito further teaches the relationship between the falling time (t) and the height (h) is defined by: $t=(2h/G)^{(1/2)}$ (G: gravitational acceleration) (see col. 5, ln. 47-67; it is obvious to an artisan in the art that the relationship between falling time and the height can be manipulated as described by Ito).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wehrenberg (US 6,520,013) is cited for detecting free fall. Kelsic (US 6,046,877) is cited for hard drive unit of a portable computer. Juckenack et al, (US 5,027,657) is cited for an acceleration sensor with cantilevered bending beam.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason C Olson whose telephone number is 703.305.8325. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30-5:30; alternate Fridays.

Application/Control Number: 10/673,169 Page 5

Art Unit: 2651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (703)308-4825. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCO

December 29, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATEL

THUSORY PATENT EXAMINER